

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

Applicant(s): Burkhardt, et al.	Art Unit: 2862
Application No.: 10/709106	Examiner: David M. Schindler
Filed: 4/14/2004	Attorney Docket No.: 800740
Title: System and Method for Inspection of Pipelines Having Internal Restrictions	

---

Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR 1.111**

Dear Sir:

The following is a response to the Office Action of March 24, 2006. The Office has (1) requested the publication dates of two references provided in an Information Disclosure Statement by Applicants, (2) set forth a statement on how to write an abstract, (3) deemed the title of the invention to be not descriptive, (4) objected to claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 9-22 based an alleged lack of antecedent basis, and (5) rejected claims 1, 2, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Krieg et al. (4,769,598). These issues are addressed in the Detailed Discussion after the following amendments to the abstract and claims.

Applicants believe that the claim amendments further distinguish Applicants' claimed invention and enable allowance of the claims. The rejected claims, as amended, define over the reference cited in the Office Action of March 24, 2006, and are fully supported by the specification as filed. Applicants request reconsideration and examination of the application in view of the following amendments and discussion.

**Specification Amendments**